

Mission Restoration Project

Cultural Resource Report

Prepared by:

Ryan Hunter

Archeologist

for:

Methow Valley Ranger District

Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest

8/26/2016

Contents

Cultural Resources	2
Regulatory Framework.....	2
Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	3
Environmental Consequences	5
Other Relevant Mandatory Disclosures.....	8
Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted	8
Acronyms	9
Glossary.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
References Cited.....	10
Appendix A: Summary of GIS Analysis Methods (optional).....	11

Figures

Figure 1: Design Features.....	7
--------------------------------	---

Cultural Resources

The following section summarizes the existing condition of cultural resources in the Mission Restoration Project analysis area, along with the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed action alternatives as analyzed in Cultural Resources Report (R2016060804005). Reference information is contained in the full resource report in the analysis file.

Regulatory Framework

Land and Resource Management Plan

The Okanogan National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) provides standards and guidelines for cultural resource effects analysis, including:

- Conduct a professionally supervised cultural resource survey on National Forest lands to identify cultural resource properties. Use sound survey strategies and the Okanogan Wenatchee National Forest (OWNF) Cultural Resource Inventory Survey Design and site location predicative model.
- Evaluate the significance of sites by applying the criteria for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register Bulletin 15).
- Consider the effects of all Forest Service undertakings on cultural resources. Coordinate the formulation and evaluation of alternatives with State and Federal agencies, and with leaders and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) of American Indian tribes with historic ties to the project planning area.

Federal Law

The *National Historic Preservation Act* (NHPA) of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470), as amended, is the foremost legislation that governs the means to identify, administrate, and preserve objects and landscapes significant to cultural and social heritage for the enrichment of future generations. Implementing regulations that clarify and expand upon the NHPA include 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), 36 CFR 63 (Determination of Eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places), and 36 CFR 296 (Protection of Archaeological Resources). The Pacific Northwest Region (R6) of the Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), signed a programmatic agreement (PA) regarding the management of cultural resources on National Forest system lands in 1997. The 1997 PA outlines specific procedures for the identification, evaluation, and protection of cultural resources during activities or projects conducted on Forest Service lands. It also establishes the process that the SHPO utilizes to review Forest Service undertakings for NHPA compliance.

Cultural resources are evaluated for their eligibility to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under the Criteria of Significance (36 CFR 60.4). The determination of eligibility is documented by a cultural resource specialist and concurred upon by the SHPO. Once the determination of eligibility has been finalized, measures must be taken to avoid or mitigate potential damage to the qualities that make a cultural resource significant. Otherwise, the project has the potential to adversely affect the site. Under 36 CFR 60.4, there are four criteria for evaluating a cultural resource. The quality of significance

of a cultural resource is evaluated based on the integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and,

(A) the association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

(B) the association with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

(C) the embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

(D) the ability to yield or potentially yield additional information important in prehistory or history.

A cultural resource that fits one of these four criteria and retains quality of significance is considered “eligible” for listing on the National Register. A cultural resource that is eligible or listed on the NRHP is called a historic property. If the cultural resource does not fit any of the National Register criteria or quality of significance, it is determined “not eligible”. Sites that cannot be determined “eligible” or “not eligible” are considered “unevaluated”. Unevaluated sites retain the same protection measures and considerations of effect afforded to “eligible” sites.

The *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) of 1970 is also a cultural resource management directive as it calls for agencies to analyze the effects of their actions on sociocultural elements of the environment. Laws such as the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, and Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites) also guide Forest Service decision-making as it relates to cultural resource management.

Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

Methodology

Cultural resource identification efforts in the Mission Restoration APE have focused on three primary types of resources: prehistoric archaeological sites, historic archaeological sites, and traditional cultural properties (TCPs), which are valued places to contemporary Indian and non-Indian communities. Cultural resource identification efforts have included pedestrian field surveys, literature reviews, traditional cultural properties research, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis, and consultation with American Indian tribes that are historically associated with the area. Two previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the Mission Restoration APE; however one of these was determined after a review of the site record and a field visit not to be a site.

In order to meet the requirements set forth in Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended, and the Forest’s 1997 PA with SHPO, an intensive cultural resource inventory of the project APE was conducted in 2016. The OWNF site location probability model was used to identify areas for survey. The model uses a variety of environmental variables such as slope, distance to water, and landform type along with oral and recorded history to predict the likelihood that an area will contain material evidence of past human

activity. Sample strategy standards require that intensive, systematic pedestrian survey be applied to no less than 100 percent of high site location probability areas, 35 percent of moderate probability areas, and 5 percent of low probability areas.

Existing Conditions

Cultural resources are fragile, non-renewable resources that chronicle the history of people traversing and utilizing the natural landscape. Four previous cultural resource surveys and inventory projects have taken place within portions of the Mission Restoration analysis area. One site within the Mission APE, consisting of a piled-rock property boundary marker, was identified in these reports. The OWNF defines a cultural resource site as a locus of purposeful and interpretable human activity containing physical manifestations of that activity (i.e. one or more features with or without artifacts; one or more formal tools found in association with other cultural materials; diverse cultural materials in densities beyond the level of one or a few lost artifacts; or physical manifestations of human activity that in the professional opinion of an archaeologist are indicative of purposeful human activity). These resources are typically at least 50 years old and are considered valuable if they have yielded or could yield scientific or scholarly information important in prehistory or history. The OWNF defines an isolated occurrence as a physical manifestation of human activity that does not appear purposeful and does not meet any criteria for designation as a “site”. Isolates are understood to consist of one or a few accidentally lost or randomly discarded artifacts.

The Mission Restoration sample survey resulted in the intensive survey of 1193 acres. This survey led to the discovery and recordation of eight (8) new cultural resource sites and four (4) new isolated occurrences. All identified sites and isolates within the Mission Restoration APE date to the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Hunter 2016).

The most commonly observed cultural resources within the Mission Restoration APE are historic features and artifacts associated with early 20th century recreation. These include bottle and can dumps, arboglyphs, and recreational camp sites. A smaller number may be incidentally related to ranching, however, sites of this type are limited to can and bottle trash dumps in areas with known historic ranching activity.

Desired Condition

The Okanogan National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) provides standards and guidelines for cultural resource identification, management and protection. Identification and evaluation of cultural resources is conducted according to the procedures established in the 1997 Programmatic Agreement. Complete site avoidance during project implementation is the preferred method of management for cultural resources that have characteristics qualifying them for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Nature of Impacts for Cultural Resources

Direct – impacts to a historic property or unevaluated cultural resource resulting from specific actions, such as biomass removal or fire-line construction using manual or mechanized equipment.

Indirect—impacts that affect a historic property or unevaluated cultural resource after an action or impacts to a larger area than where an action occurred, often as a result of changes in the condition of the landscape. For example, loss of vegetation and subsequent erosion, changes to the overall landscape setting/feeling of a site, or impacts that disturb the association between related cultural resources.

Duration of Impact for Cultural Resources

Impacts to historic properties or unevaluated cultural resources can be of short term, long term, or permanent duration. Analysis of the duration of impact is required under NEPA. The National Historic Preservation Act requires consideration of effects only; not duration specific.

Intensity/Type of Impact for Cultural Resources

Under NEPA, intensity of impacts to resources are defined as none, negligible, minor, moderate, or major. However, under NHPA, any activity that diminishes the integrity of a historic property is considered an adverse effect. Therefore, intensity of effects is not usually considered for cultural resources. The criteria for determining a project's effect on a historic property is found in 36 CFR 800.5.

Adverse – The effects of a project has the potential to alter directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association (36 CFR § 800.5(a)(1)). Typical restoration activities, including thinning, prescribed burning and transportation system changes have potential to adversely affect the integrity of cultural resources unless resource protection measures are in place. Specifically, physical damage or destruction, changes in a property's use or physical features, and visual, atmospheric, or audible intrusions might result from activities associated with mechanical thinning, reforestation, underburning, and/or the proposed road work.

Not Adverse – Effects that do not diminish the significant characteristics of a historic property. These effects do not alter any of the characteristics of an historic property that would qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP in a way that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association (36 CFR § 800.5(a)(1)).

Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 – No Action

Under the No Action alternative, no vegetation management, fuels treatment, road work, or other ground-disturbing activities would occur within the Mission Restoration APE. Ongoing and future activities, such as routine road maintenance, recreation use, grazing, and noxious weed control would occur under current Forest Plan standards. Ongoing buildup of fuels would increase the threat to fire-

sensitive historic properties, and unevaluated and undocumented cultural resources in the event of a wildfire. Natural processes such as erosion pose certain threats to cultural resources even in the event of no project actions. Routine resource and infrastructure management would continue under the Forest Plan, which mandates protection and avoidance of historic properties.

Alternative 2& 3 – Proposed Action, Action Alternative

Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures

The proposed actions (Alternatives 2& 3) involve commercial thinning, thinning small diameter trees, prescribed burning, riparian habitat improvement and stream bank improvement, construction of beaver dams and release of beavers, decommissioning of roads, changing maintenance levels for some roads, rock armoring of roads, creating hardened fords, and replacing undersized culverts at stream crossings within the project area. Alternatives 2 and 3 are similar, with Alternative 3 serving as a slightly expanded version of Alternative 2 to include rock armoring, hardened fords, and additional road treatments. Actions under both alternatives have the potential to directly affect cultural resources during implementation, especially during commercial thinning and prescribed burning.

A cultural resource survey of 1193 acres within the project area resulted in the documentation of eight sites and four isolated finds; one previously recorded site was also identified within the APE. All identified sites and isolated finds within the project area date to the late-19th to mid-20th century. Site types include can and bottle dumps, arborglyphs, and recreation/camping sites that are at more than 50 years old.

None of the sites or isolated finds in the project area are recommended as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The Section 106 cultural resource report for the project, including these evaluations (Hunter 2016) will be submitted to SHPO for concurrence on these eligibility determinations. If concurrence is received prior to implementation, no protection measures will be needed for any sites or isolated finds. Pending SHPO concurrence with the eligibility recommendations in the report, the eight sites and four isolated finds will be avoided. In the event that the nature or boundaries of the project are modified, additional consultation with a cultural resource specialist is required. In the event that cultural resources or human remains are discovered, all activities in the immediate area must stop and the Forest Archaeologist must be notified immediately in accordance with the Forest's Heritage Program Inadvertent Discovery Plan. If avoidance of a new cultural resource is not possible, mitigation will be developed in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) for the Yakama Nation and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

Figure 1: Design Features

Number	Design Feature	Why Necessary	Efficacy	Consequence of Not Applying
1	Activities will avoid eligible and unevaluated cultural resources. [Note: All known cultural resources are currently recommended as not eligible.]	Protect cultural and heritage resources	When applied according to direction from qualified heritage staff, this should result in no effect to cultural resources	Adverse effects to cultural resources
2	Contracts will include Standard Clauses BT 6.24 (Protection of Cultural Resources) and CT6.24 (Site Specific Protection Measures for Cultural Resources). These clauses allow the Forest Service to modify or cancel portions of the contract to protect known and newly discovered cultural resources.	Protect cultural and heritage resources	When applied according to direction from qualified heritage staff, this should result in no effect effects to cultural resources	Adverse effects to cultural resources
3	In the event that cultural resources are discovered as a result of project activity, all work in the vicinity of the discovery would cease until assessment by a cultural resource specialist	Protect cultural and heritage resources	When applied according to direction from qualified heritage staff, this should result in no effect to cultural resources	Adverse effects to cultural resources

Effects

No direct or indirect effects on cultural resources are anticipated given that project activities would be controlled through design features. These include protection of historic properties and unevaluated cultural resources by either flagging for avoidance or via implementing fuel reduction treatments by hand (e.g., hand-line construction, manual removal of slash from inside site boundaries and piling off-site, the use of fire retardant materials to protect fire-sensitive features present within National Register eligible or unevaluated sites). All cut material will be carried off site by hand and no trees will be planted within site boundaries. No debris piles, landing areas, fuel breaks (dozer or hand line), roads or skid trails will be constructed within site boundaries. Timber harvesting equipment or other heavy machinery will not be used within site boundaries unless the unit is designated for over-snow operations. Cultural resource monitoring would also occur within the APE and at cultural resource sites as project activities occur. Pending SHPO concurrence on site and isolated find eligibility, all project activities identified under Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 will avoid National Register eligible and unevaluated cultural resources per Section 106 of the NHPA. Ground disturbing management activities within the APE currently avoid all known cultural resources.

Cumulative Effects

Although there have been other projects that spatially and temporally overlap the APE for the Mission Restoration project, the lack of adverse direct and indirect effects means that there are also no adverse cumulative effects to cultural resources. Ongoing and future monitoring and inspections of known or newly identified cultural resources in the project area would trigger adjustments in management practices (as appropriate) to ensure that cultural resources are considered and managed to standard within the Mission Restoration Project area. As a result, design feature and protection measures should ensure that there are no cumulative effects to cultural resources in the project area.

Other Relevant Mandatory Disclosures

Compliance with LRMP and Other Relevant Laws, Regulations, Policies and Plans

Heritage and Tribal interests are regulated by federal laws that direct and guide the Forest Service in identifying, evaluating and protecting cultural resources. All of the alternatives would comply with federal laws. The Okanogan National Forest Plan tiers to these laws, therefore the proposed action alternatives meet Forest Plan Standards. This project is in compliance with 36 CFR 800 of the National Historic Preservation Act which is implemented on the Forest via a 1997 Section 106 programmatic agreement with SHPO regarding cultural resource management on national forests in the State of Washington. By providing the interdisciplinary team with appropriate input as per NEPA, all relevant laws and regulations have been met.

Summary

Although the proposed project is comprised of the types of activities that have the potential to directly or indirectly affect historic properties, adverse effects will be avoided through project design features, requiring the avoidance of eligible and unevaluated cultural resources. Provided these measures are implemented, the project will result in no direct, indirect or cumulative adverse or beneficial effects to historic properties. NRHP evaluation determinations for all identified sites and isolated finds will be submitted to SHPO for concurrence; all sites and isolated finds are recommended not eligible for the NRHP. If concurrence is received prior to project implementation, no cultural resource protection measures will be needed and the project will result in no direct, indirect or cumulative adverse or beneficial effects to historic properties.

Other Agencies and Individuals Consulted

Native American Consultation

Consultation with tribes on the Mission Restoration Project proposed actions has been conducted in accordance with NHPA, NEPA, and Executive Order 13175 "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments". Government-to-Government consultation letters were sent to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and to the Yakama Nation on April 20, 2016. No comments or concerns have been received from them to date. Documentation of compliance with the NHPA was prepared in

accordance with the Forest's 1997 Section 106 programmatic agreement with SHPO regarding cultural resource management on national forests in the State of Washington.

Acronyms

APE – Area of Potential Effect

NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act

NRHP – National Register of Historic Places

PA – Programmatic Agreement

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Officer

References Cited

Hunter, Ryan A.

2016 Cultural Resource Report for the Mission Restoration Project. Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest Heritage Program Report R2016060804005 on file at Forest Headquarters, Wenatchee, WA. This report is in draft pending formal review and submission to SHPO.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region (Region 6)

1997 Programmatic Agreement Regarding Cultural Resource Management on National Forests in the State of Washington.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration

2014 Code of Federal Regulations. Title 36 CFR 60.4 National Register of Historic Places, Criteria for Evaluation

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration

2014 Code of Federal Regulations. Title 36 CFR 63 Determination of Eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration

2014 Code of federal regulations. Title 36 CFR 296 Protection of Archaeological Resources

U.S. National Archives and Records Administration

2014 Code of federal regulations. Title 36 CFR 800 Protection of Historic Properties.

Appendix A: Summary of GIS Analysis Methods (optional)

The HeritageProbabilitySurvey (T:\FS\NFS\OkanoganWenatchee\Program\Heritage-2300\GIS\HeritageSiteLayer\Data\CulturalIn.gdb\HeritageProbabiitySurvey) layer was used to determine the heritage site probability used to develop the survey strategy. The CulturalSitePoint, CulturalSiteLine, and CulturalSitePolygon (all located in T:\FS\NFS\OkanoganWenatchee\Program\Heritage-2300\GIS\HeritageSiteLayer\Data\CulturalIn.gdb\Cultural) layers were used to identify previously recorded sites.